I affirm. To negate[[1]](#footnote-1) means **to deny the truth of.**

**The role of the ballot is to endorse the debater who proves the descriptive value of truth or falsity of the resolution.**

**1.** Debate is a competitive game- just like any other, the better competitor wins, even if there are different ways to play the game, you would not determine who wins based on those factors, for instance you wouldn’t decide who won a basketball game based on who shot three’s the best, even if that is important, you ultimately evaluate who had the most points. Even if you disagree debate isn’t a game you should concede since I care about winning.

**2.** Fiat is illusory. Nothing leaves this round other than the results on the ballot- this means even if we hypothetically breakdown oppression, it ultimately makes no real world difference other than on the ballot which means it makes no sense to be the actual ***role*** of the ballot- at the very best you can write whatever you think is important on the ballot but still evaluate based on the better debater- better for your position since more people will talk about it if it loses.

**3.** The purpose of debate is not the same as the purpose of those who participate in it, for instance in a game of chess the ultimate consideration is conformity to the rules of chess, an illegal move arguing it will result in a more educational game does not make sense in terms of the practice, the proper response would be to penalize the player and prohibit the move. Once within the game, the authority of the rules is absolute. The only constitutive rules are truth test, speech order, times, and the res.

I defend the logical ought[[2]](#footnote-2). Ought is defined as closure of belief under the rules of logic.

Logic starts with a major premise, like dirt is dirty, and it concludes with a minor premise, like the dirt in America must also be dirty. **This means the aff burden is to prove it would be logical for universities to not restrict constitutionally protected speech while the reciprocal neg burden is to prove it would make no logical sense for a university to be able to do so.**

A statement is logically valid if a) All of its premises are true, even if they are inconsistent b) If all premises are true, even if the conclusion is false c) At least one of its premises is true, even if the conclusion is false. Public colleges exist, thus they ought not prohibit constitutionally protected speech. Even if inconsistent, a statement is necessarily logical if the two premises are correct because a false conclusion cannot be drawn from two true statements. If the premises of an argument are inconsistent, the argument is *valid* because, if the premises are inconsistent, it would be impossible for them all to be true together; but in that case it would also be impossible for them all to be true and the conclusion false simultaneously *whatever the conclusion is*.

There is only one condition wherein the statement is completely false, where the condition is true and the consequent is false. Therefore, if the condition is false, then the only possible time the statement could be false has not been obtained. This means we know for certain that the statement is true. Thus if aff is winning, I get the ballot. If this condition is denied the consequent is still true.

And, denying the AC proves its validity a) contesting the burden takes a logical reason to do so meaning any other ROB or burden collapses to mine and b) Logically contesting any part of the aff proves its truth because denying any truth condition of the res makes it true under rules of logic

Prefer my definition,

1. The moral ought raises more questions than answers. Moral ought can never guide action because of the is/ought gap. The is/ought gap is only a problem in moral philosophy in which we attempt to derive a prescriptive statement from a descriptive fact about the world. For instance I can say that bleach is poisonous but it becomes impossible to draw the conclusion we morally ought not to drink it from this fact. Every system of this morality is imperceptible because it draws new relations between objects that are imperceptible. This gap is not a problem with non-moral oughts. The only way to solve this paradox is a nonmoral ought- we look to what is logical otherwise it would be nonsensical. States of affairs and actual things that exist express what ought to exist is based on our logical conclusion from that statement. This still denies the possibility of prescriptive notions because the gap still applies, however it allows descriptive obligations and statements to be drawn from logically coherent statements.

2. Textuality. The resolution is not a question of states of affairs seeing as though it assigns countries as the actor, which means it is not a question of morality but rather whether it would make sense for countries to prohibit nuclear power. Assigning an agent makes the res an active phrase rather than a passive obligatory one like “Free speech should not be prohibited”

3. Real World. The logical ought is the most every day ie she is close, she ought to be home in 10 minutes. Every day usage a) ensures it is predictable and recognizable b) transcends boundaries of debate because it is the only portable skill ie. I’ll never use topicality abstract kritiks in the real world but the debates we have about actual knowledge production and how to make decisions are used on an every day basis which means these discussions will generate a deeper understanding of meaning and ability to conduct ourselves out of round which always outweighs.

4. Epistemology. The logical ought is the only one relevant in epistemic decision- making. Only facts can guide action and since moral oughts can never give factual accounts of right and wrong we are left to make a decision based on the logical validity of a statement. This controls the internal link because epistemology is the gateway to all forms of knowledge production. In order for us to create a system of knowledge we must have the ability to conceptualize what that knowledge means in terms of rational deliberation. The logical ought is the epistemic starting point because it allows a thinker to conclude a belief in the proposition from a belief in the rational ground of to believe in a proposition. This allows for the creation of the rational assessment and creation of such propositions.

5. Linguistics. Words are only linguistically competent if they fulfill their purpose in relation to the listener. Since ought is used to determine a guide for action and the only account of the world that can be interpreted is logical, the only linguistically competent definition of ought is logic. We can only explain linguistic competence by appealing to a concept in which those linguistics can coherently be expressed. The only coherent way to formulate linguistically competent propositions is through the formulation of logical coherence.

6. Contextualization. Because the resolution questions whether public colleges can restrict speech, it is a question of the existence of institutions that define public colleges. Since the role of institutions is to determine the rights its citizens have it is only logical they can give and take away the right to speech just like any other right. It is not a question of whether speech is good, but if it logically fulfills the purpose of the agent. Since agents can only act on what is known by that agents, it would be nonsensical to ask a college if they believe in banning speech it would only make sense to ask if they could logically do it because that is the only information available to them.

**I contend the resolution is a logical statement.**

The federal government plays a large role in higher education with major influence. Congress enacts many laws that have direct influence over the processes within higher education. There are hundreds of Bureaucratic organizations that have major influence over policies. And even if the federal government does not have the ultimate authority, the state government does, in which case it is still just an extension of the national government because they are bound by the same rules.

#### First, if the US has a constitution that is means to guide rules of government action, it would make logical sense for the government to follow those rules by allowing constitutional speech.

**Second,** The state is the only form of authority and thus has the ability to give and take away rights as it sees fit meaning it will always be logical for a state to restrict liberty for that is its purpose. There is no questioning sovereign authority because they act as the ultimate definer of knowledge. Since every individual has competing claims and self interests, the government or institutions are left to reconcile those differences in order to avoid a state of nature in which there is no ultimate meaning, preventing individuals from participating.

**Third,** People enter a contract with the college, submitting to the ultimate authority of the colleges choice, making it logical for a college to do whatever it wants without question.

**Underview**

1. Claims only need to be proven true under one index for that index to be true.Even if a set of propositions is false under a given index does not necessitate it’s falsehood under a completely separate index. For instance nothing about an index excludes that it may be right to believe p and right given an index to believe non-p, thinking it is right under a given index to believe p is not having affixed myself to p in a manner that excludes non p.

2. Trivialism is true, a statement cannot fail to have truth value. Suppose a sentence p asserts its truth or falsity. In this instance, either P is true or P is false, if it is true, it is what it says it is so it is true, if it is false, it is what it says it is so it is true. The very denial of the idea that truth claims exist presupposes the truth value of the statement.

3. Neg won 8 percent[[3]](#footnote-3) more rounds at octas and quarters bids last year. Prefer statistics since they take into account all factors leading to the side bias, so any logical argument for why the aff has an advantage is empirically denied. This impact turns neg theory not weighed against the side bias since something I do that is slightly abusive just corrects for side bias. Also a reason you accept aff interps, presume aff and aff abuse is justified- I have to compensate for the side bias.

4. Neg may not deny aff the RVI on theory or T a) Reciprocity. You can win off theory or substance whereas I have to win both. This means that reading theory but denying me the RVI makes theory a NIB for me, creating a structural skew that changes the burden structure of the round- also denying them is specifically bad even if I don’t get one because it is another layer I have to beat back b) Timeskew- you could load up on 7 min of theory to moot the 1AC and go for no RVIs making the round literally impossible to win in the 4 min 1ar

5. Presume aff- a) We always default to assuming something true until proven false, or it would be almost impossible to make any claim at all because if the entire burden of proof is to show truth, it is almost impossible to say any statement has complete proof of being true, but we still evaluate claims as being true, so burden falls on neg to prove false b) Negate means deny truth so without offense to deny truth you affirm

6. The neg must gain offense from at most one route to the ballot and that route must be unconditional. To clarify, a route to the ballot consists of an independent layer of the debate that articulates a distinct judge obligation that justifies negation. A) this is key to aff strat since otherwise the neg can just layer the debate round and collapse to whatever layer the aff inevitably undercovers in the 1ar, B) clash- this interp forces the neg to engage in the AC rather than just reading several preclusive layers. C) running multiple routes to the ballot means they will likely drop one which involves time investment and distracts from discussion.

7. And, Accept all aff interpretations a) Aff speaks first they should be able to determine how the round is defined b) Uniquely key to combat strat skew because without it the aff literally has no type of chance at winning due to side bias, timeskew, and neg reactivity advantage c) It is only fair that since aff must prove the resolution true they have the ability to define what the resolution means, it is constitutive that the aff speaks first which means you accept aff interps because they are logically prior.

8. The neg may not read theory against arguments in the AC since a) this moots AC offense because they can read theory on my theory arguments in the aff which ensures that I won’t be able to leverage any theory offense in the 1AR from the AC, giving them a huge time advantage, b) it leads to contradictions since the neg can just read theory against this arg, but this indicts those shells, so there’s no way to determine which comes first. But, prefer this shell because the neg has the ability to adapt in the NC.

9. All K’s must have a concrete policy alternative that is competitive with the AC. Prefer: a) Reciprocity: rejection and reps alternatives function as NIBs for me because I have to beat back the link and win AC offense, which skews the structural burden in your favor b) Critical ed: Policy alts are better for your kritik, it allows us the ability to engage in productive discussions rather than endless critic of each other’s reps without solutions c) Engagement: There are a million different reps or things I can do that someone disagrees with- a concrete alt solves because I can at least debate about your solution, controls the internal link to your RoB because it necessarily relies on engagement to solve

10. The neg must concede that aff theory is the highest layer. Prefer this interp: the neg has the ability to win their shell and beat back the aff shell, whereas it’s impossible for me to beat back their shell and my shell in the 2AR. The 2NR explodes neg’s strategic options (they can kill aff on defense on theory and go for substance, or just go hard for one shell), but aff needs to sit down on one arg to win in the 2AR. It’s impossible to overcome neg abuse w/out the highest layer because I have to beat back the highest layer to access response to abuse. Prefer structural weighing args about aff vs. neg since they apply to each round so are most likely to establish communal norms, and thus are best for competing interps, which means it also precludes meta-theory. This also means my theory comes before T since it’s also inherent to every round, not a particular topic.

**Frontlines**

A2 Oppression ROB

#### The claim that oppression should be the basis for winning a debate round commodifies the ballot.  It is is not a tool of emancipation, but rather a tool of revenge---it serves as a palliative that denies their investment in oppression as a means by which to claim the power of victory- turns case. **Enns 12**—Professor of Philosophy at McMaster University (Dianne, The Violence of Victimhood, 28-30)

Guilt and Ressentiment We need to think carefully about what is at stake here. Why is this perspective appealing, and what are its effects? At first glance, the argument appears simple: white, privileged women, in their theoretical and practical interventions, must take into account the experiences and conceptual work of women who are less fortunate and less powerful, have fewer resources, and are therefore more subject to systemic oppression. The lesson of feminism's mistakes in the civil rights era is that this “mainstream” group must not speak for other women. But such a view must be interrogated. Its effects, as I have argued, include a veneration of the other, moral currency for the victim, and an insidious competition for victimhood. We will see in later chapters that these effects are also common in situations of conflict where the stakes are much higher. ¶ We witness here a twofold appeal: otherness discourse in feminism appeals both to the guilt of the privileged and to the resentment, or ressentiment, of the other. Suleri's allusion to “embarrassed privilege” exposes the operation of guilt in the misunderstanding that often divides Western feminists from women in the developing world, or white women from women of color.The guilt of those who feel themselves deeply implicated in and responsible for imperialism merely reinforces an imperialist benevolence, polarizes us unambiguously by locking us into the categories of victim and perpetrator, and blinds us to the power and agency of the other. Many fail to see that it is embarrassing and insulting for those identified as victimized others not to be subjected to the same critical intervention and held to the same demands of moral and political responsibility. Though we are by no means equal in power and ability, wealth and advantage, we are all collectively responsible for the world we inhabit in common. The condition of victimhood does not absolve one of moral responsibility. I will return to this point repeatedly throughout this book.¶ Mohanty's perspective ignores the possibility that one can become attached to one's subordinated status, which introducesthe concept of ressentiment, the focus of much recent interest in the injury caused by racism and colonization. Nietzsche describes ressentiment as the overwhelming sentiment of “slave morality,” the revolt that begins when ressentiment itself becomes creative and gives birth to values. 19 The sufferer in this schema seeks out a cause for his suffering—“ a guilty agent who is susceptible to suffering”— someone on whom he can vent his affects and so procure the anesthesia necessary to ease the pain of injury. The motivation behind ressentiment, according to Nietzsche, is the desire “to deaden, by means of a more violent emotion of any kind, a tormenting, secret pain that is becoming unendurable, and to drive it out of consciousness at least for the moment: for that one requires an affect, as savage an affect as possible, and, in order to excite that, any pretext at all.” 20 In its contemporary manifestation, Wendy Brown argues thatressentiment acts as the“righteous critique of power from the perspective of the injured,” which “delimits a specific site of blame for suffering by constituting sovereign subjects and events as responsible for the ‘injury’ of social subordination.” Identities are fixed in an economy of perpetrator and victim, in which revenge, rather than power or emancipation, is sought for the injured, making the perpetrator hurt as the sufferer does. 21¶ 30¶ Such a concept is useful for understanding why an ethics of absolute responsibility to the other appeals to the victimized. Brown remarks that, for Nietzsche, the source of the triumph of a morality rooted in ressentiment is the denial that it has any access to power or contains a will to power. Politicized identities arise as both product of and reaction to this condition; the reaction is a substitute for action— an “imaginary revenge,” Nietzsche calls it. Suffering then becomes a social virtueat the same time that the sufferer attempts to displace his suffering onto another. The identity created by ressentiment, Brown explains, becomes invested in its own subjection not only through its discovery of someone to blame,and a new recognition and revaluation of that subjection, but also through the satisfaction of revenge. 22¶ The outcome of feminism's attraction to theories of difference and otherness is thus deeply contentious. First, wewitness the further reificationreification of the very oppositions in question and a simple reversal of the focus from the same to the other. This observation is not new and has been made by many critics of feminism, but it seems to have made no serious impact on mainstream feminist scholarship or teaching practices in women's studies programs. Second, in the eagerness to rectify the mistakes of “white, middle-class, liberal, western” feminism, the other has been uncritically exalted,which has led in turn to simplistic designations of marginal, “othered” status and, ultimately,a competition for victimhood. Ultimately, this approach has led to a new moral code in which ethics is equated with the responsibility of the privileged Western woman, while moral immunity is granted to the victimized other. Ranjana Khanna describes this operation aptly when she writes that in the field of transnational feminism, the reification of the other has produced “separate ethical universes” in which the privileged experience paralyzing guilt and the neocolonized, crippling resentment. The only “overarching imperative” is that one does not comment on another's ethical context. An ethical response turns out to be a nonresponse. 23 Let us turn now to an exploration of this third outcome.

**Turn: Their argument forces the judge into the role of coercer and defeats the purpose of critical pedagogy- outweighs their impact because this is cyclical violence.**

**Rickert** (Thomas, “"Hands Up, You're Free": Composition in a Post-Oedipal World”, JacOnline Journal,)

An example of the connection between violence and pedagogy is implicit inthe notion of being "schooled" as it has been conceptualized **by** Giroux [is] and Peter Mcl.aren. They explain, "Fundamental to the principles that inform critical pedagogy is the conviction that schooling for self- and social empowerment is ethically prior to questions of epistemology or to a mastery oftechnical or social skills that are primarily tied to the logic of the marketplace" (153-54). A presumption here is that it is the teacher who knows (best**)**, and this orientation gives the concept of schooling a particular bite: though it presents itself as oppositional to the state and the dominant forms of pedagogy that serve the state and its capitalist interests, it nevertheless reinscribes an authoritarian model that is congruent with any number of oedipalizing pedagogies that "school" the student in proper behavior. As Diane Davis notes, radical, feminist, and liberatory pedagogies "often camouflage pedagogical violence in their move from one mode of 'normalization' to another" and "function within a disciplinary matrix of power, a covert carceral system, that aims to create useful subjects for particular political agendas" (212). Such oedipalizing pedagogies are less effective in practice than what the claims for them assert; indeed, the attempt to "school" students in the manner called for by Giroux and McLaren is complicitous with the malaise of postmodern cynicism. Students will dutifully go through their liberatory motions, producing the proper assignments, but it remains an open question whether they carry an oppositional politics with them. The "critical distance" supposedly created with liberatory pedagogy also opens up a cynical distance toward the writing produced in class

A2 Implementation T

A: Counter interp: Aff can read truth testing ROB and only defend the logical validity of the res without implementing a specific policy.

B: I meet

C:

1. Textuality: Even if resolved means policy my interp is more specific to this topic, me winning ought means logical is an independent reason my interp is textually accurate because the res is literally a question of logic not policy

2: Predictability: My interp is much more predictable, the res is underlimited- there are thousands of plan texts the aff could have, so I am locked into one advocacy with only a few pieces of offense.

3: Ground: Policy-making gives neg infinite ground with PICs, DAs, Ks, T, and theory. My interp allows equal division of ground. Prefer structural ground to substantive- there’s no way to tell who’s on the wrong side of the topic lit but structural is verifiable.

On their Interp:

1. Extend the Nardin evidence, even if their interp is better for debate that is not a reason you vote on it, the only constitutive rules are the resolution, truth testing, and speech times, if I’m winning textuality you vote aff on T

2. Extend the Grey evidence- they say you ought to vote for fairness and educations which rely on a conception of a good, which he concedes doesn’t exist, that means T is irrelevant and you vote on truth testing

3. Truth testing denies policy-making: Consequences are calculable into infinity so there’s no way to determine whether policy will be “true or false”, they concede truth testing which means you prefer my interp

4. Extend textaulity, the resolution is a passive phrase meaning it doesn’t assign a proactive obligation to where a policy would make sense

5. Extend Wedgewood- they try to create a truth about what the resolution means- they’ve conceded the only ought statement able to actual create factual accounts is logical- means I control the internal link to their interp

6. Extend Wedgewood 2- they concede that logical ought statements are the only linguistically competent ones- linguistics control the meaning and ability to understand their interp, means my interp is a prerequisite anyways

Overview

1. Extend the 8% side bias- they concede any reason I’m abusive just accounts for the side bias, which turns their impacts

2. Extend all T interps are NIBs which means I get to weigh substance of truth testing against the interp, my arguments have 100% strength of link because they are either true or false, means if I win one reason the res is true T doesn’t matter

3. Extend subpoints a-e for accept aff interps- this means even if they win the shell you accept my interps because the structural fairness of accepting them outweighs the substantive abuse in the shell with the strat skew, time skew, reactivity advantage, and side bias.

AT Scarsdale

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/defend>

According to Merriam Webster Dictionary: Defend means to drive an attack away/ prevent an attack

I meet- they didn’t read implementation arguments which means its impossible to defend them.

CX solves

Unmeetable interps bad, independent reason to drop them, can’t impose a burden they can’t even provide an opportunity for me to meet

They say semantics first

AT Spikes K

Thompson says spikes that can be flowed are okay, this includes flashing and proper numbering. He also says that it isn’t a reason to drop the spikes or me, the aff isn’t predicated on you dropping stuff, it’s just strategic which is what Thompsons advocates for. I solve 3 ways

1. Flashing

2. Very good numbering and structure

3. CX checks

**Thompson,**

Marshall Thompson – Former Debater and Current Coach. http://vbriefly.com/2015/04/21/marshall-thoughts/

First, I think that evaluating who is the better debater via who dropped spikes excludes lots of specific individuals, especially those with learning disabilities. I have both moderate dyslexia and extreme dysgraphia.  Despite debating for four years with a lot of success I was never able to deal with spikes. I could not ‘mind-sweep’ because my flow was not clear enough to find the arguments I needed, and I was simply too slow a reader to be able to reread through the relevant parts of a case during prep-time. I was very lucky, my junior year (which was the first year I really competed on the national circuit) spikes were remarkably uncommon. Looking back it was in many ways the low-point for spike. They started to be used some my senior year but not anything like the extent they are used today. I am entirely confident, however, in saying that if spikes had had anywhere near the same prevalence when I started doing ‘circuit’ debate as they do now, I—with the specific ways that dyslexia/dysgraphia has affected me—would never have bothered to try to debate national circuit LD (I don’t intend to imply this is the same for anyone who has dyslexia or dysgraphia, the particular ways that learning disabilities manifest is often difficult to track). Now, **the mere fact that I would have been prevented from succeeding in the activity** and possibly from being able to enjoyably compete **is not an argument. I never would have been able to succeed at calligraphy, but I would hardly claim we should therefore not make the calligraphy club about handwriting. Instead, what I am suggesting is that** the values that debate cares about **and should be assessing** are not questions of handwriting or notation**.** We expect notation instrumentally to avoid intervention, but it is not one of the ends of debate in itself. **Thus, if there is a viable principle upon which we can decrease this strategic dimension of spikes but maintain non-intervention I think we should do so**. I was ‘good’ at philosophy, ‘good’ at argument generation, ‘good’ at research, ‘good’ at casing, ‘great’ at framework comparison etc. It seems to me that **as long as I can flow well enough** to easily follow a non-tricky aff **it was proper that my learning disabilities not be an obstacle to my success**. (One other thing to note, while I was a ‘framework debater’ who could never have been good at spikes because of my learning disability I have never met a ‘tricky debater’ who could not have succeeded in debate without tricks simply in virtue of their intelligence and technical proficiency; that is perhaps another reason to favor my account.) Second, spikes add in a greater dimension of randomnessto the round. If they are seen then they are ‘caught’ then they don’t really help you win, if they are not they do. Against most debaters one can ‘reliably’ beat them or will ‘reliably’ lose to them. With cases with lots of spike **however,** one might generally beat them and **then** once just miss a spike and it is all over.

**Fairness is constitutive**

Galloway[[4]](#footnote-4) ‘07

**Debate** a**[i]s a dialogue** sets an argumentative table, where all parties receive a relatively fair opportunity to voice their position. Anything that fails to allow participants to have their position articulated denies one side of the argumentative table a fair hearing. **The affirmative side is set by the topic and fairness requirements**. While affirmative teams have recently resisted affirming the topic, in fact, the topic selection process is rigorous, taking the relative ground of each topic as its central point of departure.¶ **Setting the affirmative reciprocally sets the negative**. The negative crafts approaches to the topic consistent with affirmative demands. The negative crafts disadvantages, counter-plans, and critical arguments premised on the arguments that the topic allows for the affirmative team. According to fairness norms, each side sits at a relatively balanced argumentative table.¶ **When** one side takes more than its share, **competitive equity suffers**. However, it also undermines the respect due to the other involved in the dialogue. When one side excludes the other, **it** fundamentally **denies the personhood of the other participant** (Ehninger, 1970, p. 110). A pedagogy of debate as dialogue takes this respect as a fundamental component. A desire to be fair is **a** fundamental condition of a dialogue that takes the form of a demand for equality of voice. **Far from** being **a b**anal **request for links** to a disadvantage, **fairness** is a demand for respect, a demand **to be heard**, a demand **that** a voice backed by literally months upon months of preparation, **research, and** critical **thinking** not be silenced.¶ Affirmative **cases that suspend** basic **fairness** norms operate to **exclude** particular negative **strategies.** Unprepared, **one side comes** to the argumentative table **unable to** meaningfully **participate** in a dialogue. They are unable to “understand what ‘went on…’” and are left to the whims of time and power (Farrell, 1985, p. 114). Hugh Duncan furthers this line of reasoning:¶ Opponents not only tolerate but honor and respect each other because in doing so they enhance their own chances of thinking better and reaching sound decisions. Opposition is necessary because it sharpens thought in action. We assume that argument, discussion, and talk, among free an informed people who subordinate decisions of any kind, because it is only through such discussion that we reach agreement which binds us to a common cause…If we are to be equal…relationships among equals must find expression in many formal and informal institutions (Duncan, 1993, p. 196-197).¶ Debate compensates for the exigencies of the world by offering a **framework** that **maintains equality for the sake of the conversation** (Farrell, 1985, p. 114).¶ For example, **a**n affirmative **case** on the 2007-2008 college topic might **defend neither state nor international action in the Middle East, and yet claim to be germane to the topic** in some way. **The case** essentially denies the arguments that state action is oppressive or that actions in the international arena are philosophically or pragmatically suspect. Instead of allowing for the dialogue to be modified by the interchange of the affirmative case and the negative response, the affirmative [the case] **subverts any meaningful role to the neg**ative team, preventing them from offering effective “counter-word” and **undermining the value of** a meaningful **exchange** of speech acts. Germaneness and other **substitutes for topical action do not accrue the dialogical benefits** **of topical advocacy.**
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